Importation of Papaya Fruit, *Carica*papaya, from Nicaragua into the Continental United States

Qualitative, Pathway-Initiated Pest Risk Assessment

April 1998

Agency Contact:

Biological Assessment and Taxonomic Support Plant Protection and Quarantine Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service U.S. Department of Agriculture 4700 River Road, Unit 133 Riverdale, MD 20737-1236

Table of Contents

Α.	In	troduction	1
В.	R	isk Assessment	1
	1.	Initiating Event: Proposed Action	1
	2.	Assessment of Weediness Potential of Papaya	2
	3.	Previous Risk Assessments, Current Status, and Pest Interceptions	3
	4.	Pest List: Pests Associated with Carica spp	4
	5 .	List of Quarantine Pests	9
	6.	Quarantine Pests Likely to Follow Pathway	9
	7.	Economic Importance: Consequences of Introduction 1	10
	8.	Likelihood of Introduction 1	10
	9.	Conclusion: Pest Risk Potential and Phytosanitary Measures	10
C.		References	11

A. Introduction

This pest risk assessment was prepared by the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) to examine plant pest risks associated with the importation into the United States of **fresh fruits of papaya** (Carica papaya) grown in Nicaragua. This is a qualitative pest risk assessment, that is, estimates of risk are expressed in qualitative terms such as high or low rather than numerical terms such as probabilities or frequencies. The details of methodology and rating criteria can be found in: Pathway-Initiated Pest Risk Assessment: Guidelines for Qualitative Assessments, version 4.0 (USDA, 1995); available from the individual named in the proposed regulations, or on the web site: www.aphis.usda.gov/ppq/bats/bant.

International plant protection organizations, e.g., North American Plant Protection Organization (NAPPO) and the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), provide guidance for conducting pest risk analyses. The methods used to initiate, conduct, and report this plant pest risk assessment are consistent with guidelines provided by NAPPO and FAO. Our use of biological and phytosanitary terms conforms with the NAPPO Compendium of Phytosanitary Terms (Hopper, 1996) and the Definitions and Abbreviations (Introduction Section) in International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures, Section 1—Import Regulations: Guidelines for Pest Risk Analysis (FAO, 1996).

The Guidelines for Pest Risk Analysis provided by FAO (1996) describe three stages in pest risk analysis. This document satisfies the requirements of FAO Stages 1 (initiation) and 2 (risk assessment).

B. Risk Assessment

1. Initiating Event: Proposed Action

This pest risk assessment is commodity-based, and therefore "pathway-initiated"; the assessment is in response to a request for USDA authorization to allow importation of a particular commodity presenting a potential plant pest risk. In this case, the importation of **fresh fruits of papaya** (Carica papaya) grown in Nicaragua is a potential pathway for introduction of plant pests. Regulatory authority for the importation of fruits and vegetables from foreign sources into the U.S. is found in 7 CFR §319.56.

2. Assessment of Weediness Potential of Papaya, Carica papaya

The results of the weediness screening (Table 1) did not prompt a pest-initiated risk assessment.

Table 1: Process for Determining Weediness Potential of Commodity

Commodity: Carica papaya L. (papaya) (Caricaceae)

Phase 1: Carica papaya is grown commercially in Florida, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

Papaya is also grown in greenhouses throughout the United States, primarily as a curiosity.

Phase 2: Is the species listed in:

<u>NO</u>	Geographical Atlas of World Weeds (Holm et al., 1979)
NO	World's Worst Weeds (Holm et al., 1977)
<u>NO</u>	World Weeds, Natural Histories and Distribution, (Holm et al., 1996)
<u>NO</u>	Report of the Technical Committee to Evaluate Noxious Weeds; Exotic Weeds
	for Federal Noxious Weed Act (Gunn and Ritchie, 1982)
NO	Economically Important Foreign Weeds (Reed, 1977)
<u>NO</u>	Weed Science Society of America list (WSSA, 1989)
<u>NO</u>	Is there any literature reference indicating weediness (e.g., AGRICOLA, CAB,
	Biological Abstracts, AGRIS; search on "species name" combined with
	"weed").

Phase 3: Conclusion:

Carica papaya is grown for commercial and other purposes throughout the United States and the scientific literature provided no indication of weediness potential.

3. Previous Risk Assessments, Current Status, and Pest Interceptions

3a. Decision history for Carica papaya from Central America

- 1971 Costa Rica: permitted entry subject to fumigation or adequate processing in lieu of treatment.
- 1990- Panama: denied entry, no acceptable treatment for medfly.
- 1993 Guatemala: denied entry, lack of treatment facilities in Guatemala.
- 1995 Belize: permitted entry subject to treatment as a condition of entry or from a medfly free area.
- 1997 Panama: pest risk assessment completed, no management decision.

3b. Pest interceptions from 1985-1998 from Central America

Country	Pest	Part	Total
Belize	Blapstinus sp .	Fruit	1
Belize			1
	Dicrepidius sp.	Fruit	1
Belize	Elateridae, species of	Fruit	1
Belize	Phyllophaga sp.	Fruit	1
Belize	Pseudococcus sp.	Fruit	1
Belize	Pseudococcidae, species of.	Fruit	3
Costa Rica	Anastrepha sp.	Fruit*	1
Costa Rica	Crytomenus bergi	Fruit	1
Costa Rica	Diaspididae, species of	Leaf	1
Costa Rica	Listronotus sp.	Fruit	1
Costa Rica	Paragonatus costaricensis	Fruit	1
El Salvador	Coccidae, species of	Fruit	1
Guatemala	Agromyzidae, species of	Fruit	1
Guatemala	Coccidae, species of	Leaf	1
Guatemala	Diaspididae, species of	Fruit	1
Guatemala	Tortricidae, species of	Fruit	1
Panama	Aleyrodidae, species of	Leaf	1
Panama	Coccidae, species of	Leaf	1
Panama	Lepidoptera, species of	Fruit	1

^{*} Interception taken from fruit carried in baggage.

4. Pest List: Pests Associated with Carica spp.

The pest list in Table 2 was developed after a review of the information sources listed in USDA (1995). The list summarizes information on the distribution of each pest, pest-commodity association, and regulatory history.

Table 2: Pest List - <i>Carica</i> spp.			
Scientific Name, Classification	Distribution ¹	Comments ²	References
Pathogens			
Asperisporium caricae (Spegazzini) Maugblanc (Fungi Imperfecti: Hyphomycetes)	NI,US	c,f,o	CMI, 1972; Farr et al., 1989; USDA, 1998
Botrytis cinerea Pers.:Fr. (Fungi Imperfecti: Hyphomycetes)	Worldwide	c,f,o,v	CMI, 1974a; Farr <i>et al.</i> , 1989; Wellman, 1977
Calonectria crotalariae (C.A. Loos) D.K. Bell & Sobers (Pyrenomycetes: Hypocreales)	US, Warm- temperate and tropical regions	a,o,v	Farr et al., 1989
Choanephora cucurbitarum (Berk. & Ravenel) Thaxt. (Zygomycetes: Mucorales)	US, Temperate to tropical regions	a,c,o,v	Farr et al., 1989
Colletotrichum gleosporioides (Penz.) Penz. and Sacc. In Penz. (Fungi Imperfecti: Coelomycetes)	CZ,US	c,f,o,v	Farr <i>et al.</i> , 1989; Wellman, 1977
Corynespora cassilicola (Berk. & M.A. Curtis) C.T. Wei (Fungi Imperfecti: Coelomycetes)	CZ,US	c,f,o,v	Wellman, 1977
Erysiphe cichoracearum D.C. (Pyrenomycetes: Erysiphales)	Worldwide	c,o,v	CMI, 1967a; Farr et al., 1998
Fusarium solani (Mart.)Sacc. (Fungi Imperfecti: Hyphomycetes)	Worldwide	c,o,v	CMI, 1964a; Holliday, 1980
Phoma (=Ascochyta) caricae (Pat.) Punithalingam	NI,US(HI)	О	McGuire and Crandall, 1967
Phyllosticta caricae-papayae Allesch. (Fungi Imperfecti: Coelomycetes)	FL, subtropical and tropical regions	a,o,v	Farr et al., 1989
Phytophthora capsici Leonian (Oomycetes: Peronosporales)	CZ,US	c,o,v	CMI, 1985
Phytophthora nicotianae Brea de Haan var. parsitica (Dastur) G.M. Waterhouse (Oomycetes: Peronosporales)	CZ,US	c,f,o,v	CMI, 1964b

	T		
Phytophthora palmivora (E.J. Butler) E. J. Butler (Oomycetes: Peronosporales)	NI,US	c,o	Farr et al., 1989; McGuire and Crandall, 1967
Pythium aphanidermatum (Edson) Fitzp. (Oomycetes: Peronosporales)	CZ,US	a,c,o,v	CMI, 1964c, Farr et al., 1989
Pythium ultimum Trow (Oomycetes: Peronosporales)	US, Cosmopolitan	a,c,o,v	Farr et al., 1989
Pythium vexans de Bary (Oomycetes: Peronosporales)	US, Cosmopolitan	o,v	Farr et al., 1989
Rhizoctonia solani Kuhn (Fungi Imperfecti: Agonomycetes)	Worldwide	a,c,o,v	CMI, 1974b; Farr et al., 1989
Rhizopus stolonifer (Ehrenb.:Fr.)Vuill. (Zygomycetes: Mucorales)	Worldwide	b,c,o,v	CMI, 1977, Farr et al., 1989
Sclerotium rolfsi Sacc. (Fungi Imperfecti: Agonomycetes)	NI,US	a,c,o	CMI, 1992
Septoria caricae Speg. (Fungi Imperfecti: Coelomycetes)	CZ	a,v	Wellman, 1977
Sphaerotheca fuliginea (Schlechtend.Fr.) Pollacci (Pyrenomycetes: Erysiphales)	Worldwide	c,f,o,v	CMI, 1967b, Farr et al., 1989
Stemphylium lycopersici (Enjoji) W. Yamamota (Fungi Imperfecti: Hyphomycetes)	CZ,US	o,v	CMI, 1975, Farr et al., 1989
Bacteria			
Papaya bunchy top disease (unidentified bacteria)	NI,US	f,o	Davis <i>et al.,</i> 1996; Krochmal, 1974
Viruses			
Papaya ringspot virus	NI,US	f,o	Ploetz et al., 1994
Tomato spotted wilt tospovirus	Worldwide	f,o	Brunt <i>et al.</i> , 1996
Arthropods			
Aconophora femoralis Stal. (Homoptera: Membracidae)	NI	a	Maes, 1988; McGuire and Crandall, 1967
Aleurocanthus woglumi Ashby (Homoptera: Aleyrodidae)	NI,US	h	EPPO, 1995; FAO, 1993; Mound and Halsey, 1978; USDA, 1998

	1		
Anastrepha fraterculus complex (Wiedemann) (Diptera: Tephritidae)	NI	*Z _q	Borge and Basedow, 1997; Malavasi et al., 1995, Baker et al., 1944; Steck, 1991; Steck and Sheppard, 1993; Stone, 1942
Anastrepha ludens (Loew) (Diptera: Tephritidae)	NI	*Z _n	Borge and Basedow, 1997; USDA, 1998; White and Elson- Harris, 1992
Anastrepha obliqua (Macquart) (Diptera: Tephritidae)	NI	*Z _m	Borge and Basedow, 1997; White and Elson-Harris, 1992
Anastrepha serpentina (Wiedemann) (Diptera: Tephritidae)	NI	*Z _n	Borge and Basedow, 1997
Anastrepha striata (Loew) (Diptera: Tephritidae)	NI	*Z _n	Borge and Basedow, 1997
Aphis gossypii Glover (Homoptera: Aphidae	NI,US	c,f,o	Blackman and Eastop, 1984
Bemisia tabaci (Gennadius) (Homoptera: Aleyrodidae)	NI,US	c,f,o	USDA, 1998
Ceratitis capitata (Wiedemann) Diptera: Tephritidae)	NI,US³	Z _o	USDA, 1998; White and Elson-Harris, 1992
Conchaspis angraeci Cockerell (Homoptera: Coccidae)	NI,US	c,o	Ben-Dov, 1981; Mamet, 1954
Eotetranychus lewisi McGregor (Acari: Tetranychidae)	NI,US	c,o	EPPO, 1995; Jeppson et al., 1975
Erinnyis ello (L.) (Lepidoptera: Sphingidae)	NI,US	c,o	Hodges <i>et al.</i> , 1983; McGuire and Crandall, 1967
Ferrisia virgata Cockerell (Homoptera: Coccoidea)	NI,US	c,o	Ben-Dov, 1994; CIE, 1966
Hypothenemus crudiae (Panzer) (Coleoptera: Scolytidae)	NI,US	a,o	Maes and Equihua, 1988, Poole and Gentili, 1996
Hypothenemus eruditus Westwood (Coleoptera: Scolytidae)	NI,US	a,o	Maes and Equihua, 1988; Poole and Gentili, 1996
Hypothenemus paralellus (Hopkins) (Coleoptera: Scolytidae)	NI	a	Maes and Equihua, 1988
Hypothenemus hampei (Ferrari) (Coleoptera: Scolytidae)	NI	a	Maes and Equihua, 1988

Macrosiphum euphorbiae (Thomas) (Homoptera: Aphidae)	NI	c,f,o	Blackman and Eastop, 1984
Milviscutulus mangiferae (Nietner) (Homoptera: Coccidae)	NI,US	c,o	Ben-Dov <i>et al.</i> , 1975
Myzus persicae (Sulzer) (Homoptera: Aphidae)	NI,US	c,f.o	Blackman and Eastop, 1984
Nipaecoccus nipae (Maskell) (Homoptera: Coccoidea)	NI,US	c,o	Ben-Dov, 1994
Parasaissetia nigra (Nietner) (Homoptera: Coccidae)	NI,US	c,o	Ben-Dov, 1978; EPPO, 1995
Philephedra tuberculosa Nakahara and Gill (Homoptera: Coccidae)	NI,US	О	Nakahara and Gill, 1985
Polyphagotarsonemus latus Banks (Acari: Tarsonemidae)	NI,US	c,o	CIE, 1986
Rhynchophorus palmarum (Linne) (Coleoptera: Curculionidae)	NI	a	McGuire and Crandall, 1967
Tetranychus desertorum Banks (Acari: Tetranychidae)	NI,US	О	Jeppson, et al., 1975
Toxotrypana curvicauda Gerstaecker (Diptera: Tephritidae)	NI,US	o4(except HI),z	Borge and Basedow, 1997, White and Elson-Harris, 1992
Xyleborus volvulus (Fabricius) (Coleoptera: Scolytidae)	NI,US	a,c,o	Maes and Equihua, 1988; Poole and Gentili, 1996

¹ Distribution legend: NI = Nicaragua; US = United States; HI = Hawaii

b = Not likely to be a primary plant pest.

c = Listed in USDA's non-reportable dictionary as non-actionable.

f = Pest ocurs in the U.S. and is not subject to official restrictions and regulations.

- h = Quarantine pest: pest has limited distribution in the U.S. and is under official control as follows: (1) pest listed by name in USDA's pest dictionary, official quarantine action may be taken on this pest when intercepted on this commodity and, (2) pest is a program pest.
- o = Organism does not meet the geographic or regulatory definition of a quarantine pest.
- v = No specific reports of the pest from the country of export, but regional reports exist and the pest may be present in the country of export.
- z_i = Internal pest: is known to attack or infest and it would be reasonable to expect the pest may remain with the commodity during process and shipping.

 $z_m = Laboratory infestations only.$

- z_n = Not considered a regulatory host although a few rare interception records, most likely backyard and/or ripe fruits.
- z₁ = This complex is of the Mexican-Central American population and does not have the host range as the *A. fraterculus* species in South America.
- z = Papaya is considered to be a poor host for med fly.

² Comments: a = Pest mainly associated with a plant part other than the commodity.

³ Ceratitis capitata has been detected on occasion in the United States. Whenever C. capitata has been detected, a quarantine was established and an eradication program was implemented. C. capitata is considered a quarantine pest in the United States.

⁴ *Toxotrypana curvicauda* is not considered a quarantine pest in the continental U. S. It is considered a quarantine pest for Hawaii and host material is prohibited.

* The fruit flies, Anastrepha fraterculus, A. ludens, A. obliqua, A. striata and Ceratitis capitata have been reported to attack papaya in some countries and they occur in Nicaragua. Studies conducted in Costa Rica on papaya from April 1986 until August 1990 (Lara et al., 1989; Lara, 1990) on Ceratitis capitata and four species of Anastrepha, A. fraterculus, A. obliqua, A. serpentina, and A. striata document that papaya is not a good host. None of the fruits were infested when subjected to natural infestations in the field at the commercial harvesting ripeness index or slightly above (0, 1, 2, and 3).**

In forced field infestations studies, even under relatively high insect pressure conditions, none of the five species infested papaya at or below harvesting ripeness index 2. A. striata did not infest at all at any ripeness index. A. obliqua and A. fraterculus infested only fruits at index 5, and to a very low level i.e. A. obliqua - 17 pupae were recovered from 30 fruits at ripeness index of 5, only 3 adults emerged.

A. serpentine was successfully reproduced in papayas at ripeness index of 4. In another test, using a laboratory reared strain that had been reared for 5, 6, 7 consecutive generations in papaya fruit at ripeness index 3 and 4, adults were recovered from fruit with a ripeness index of 1. It may be that the fruit fly colony was already favorably conditioned to the ripeness index. In these studies the laboratory-reared strain infested papaya fruit significantly more than the wild strain.

Research (Malavasi *et al.*, 1995) in Brazil to determine host susceptibility of "solo" papaya to *Cerititis capitata* and *Anastrepha fraterculus* documented similar results.

The Anastrepha fraterculus species in of the Mexican - Central American population (Stone, 1942; Baker et al., 1944; Steck, 1991; Steck and Sheppard, 1993) and does not have the host range as the species of A. fraterculus in South America discussed by Malavasi et al., 1992. According to the authors listed above A. fraterculus represents a complex of species.

A. *ludens* was not included in these tests but based upon PPQ's many years experience with imported Mexican papaya it appears that on rare occasions overripe fruits may be attractive to species of *Anastrepha*.

The absence of a significant number of Anastrepha interceptions from commercial and non commercial papaya despite our many years experience with this fruits provides further documentation that the fruits does not serve as a normal host in nature for *Anastrepha*. PPQ does not considered papaya to be a host of *Anastrepha* spp. and based on the information presented above we conclude that commercial shipments of papaya from Nicaragua does not pose a threat of introducing *Anastrepha* spp.

**Color scale

- 0 = mature green, fully grown fruit with 100% dark green peel
- 1 = color break, actual yellow color over not more than 20% of total surface and surrounded by light green
- 2 = approximately one quarter of surface light yellow to firm yellow surrounded by light green
- 3 = up to one-half of surface yellow with neighboring areas light green turning yellow
- 4 = over one-half of the surface yellow with neighboring areas light green turning yellow
- 5 = full yellow or the proximal end green to light green

5. List of Quarantine Pests

The list of quarantine pests for commercial shipments of papaya from Nicaragua is provided in Table 3. Should any of these pests be intercepted on commercial (or any other) shipments of *Carica papaya* quarantine action may be taken.

Table 3: Quarantine Pests:

Arthropods Aleurocanthus woglumi

Ceratitis capitata

Toxotrypana curvicauda

6. Quarantine Pests Likely to Follow Pathway

Only those quarantine pests that can reasonably be expected to follow the pathway, *i. e.*, be included in commercial shipments of *Carica papaya*, were analyzed in detail (USDA, 1995). Only quarantine pests listed in Table 4 were selected for further analysis and subjected to steps 7-9 below.

Table 4: Quarantine Pest Selected for Further Analysis:

Arthropods Ceratitis capitata

Other plant pests in this Assessment, not chosen for further scrutiny, may be potentially detrimental to the agricultural production systems of the United States; however, there were a variety of reasons for not subjecting them to further analysis. For example, they are associated mainly with plant parts other than the commodity; they may be associated with the commodity (however, it was not considered reasonable to expect these pests to remain with the commodity during processing); they have been intercepted as biological contaminants of these commodities during inspections by Plant Protection and Quarantine Officers but would not be expected to be present with every shipment. In addition, the biological hazard of organisms identified only to the generic level are not assessed due to the lack of adequate biological/taxonomic information. This lack of biological information on any given insect or pathogen should not be equated with low risk. By necessity, pest risk assessments focus on those organisms for which biological information is available. By developing detailed assessments for known pests that inhabit a variety of niches on the parent species, *i.e.* on the surface of or within the bark/wood, on the foliage, etc., effective mitigation measures can be developed to eliminate the known organism and any similar unknown ones that inhabit the same niches.

7. Economic Importance: Consequences of Introduction

The consequences of introduction were considered for each quarantine pest selected for further analysis. For qualitative, pathway-initiated pest risk assessments, these risks are estimated by rating each pest with respect to five risk elements (USDA, 1995). Table 5 shows the risk ratings for these risk elements.

Table 5: Risk Rating: Consequences of Introduction								
Pest	Climate/ Host	Host Range	Dispersal	Economic	Environ- mental	Risk Rating		
Ceratitis capitata	high	high	high	high	high	high		

8. Likelihood of Introduction

Each pest is rated with respect to introduction potential, *i.e.*, entry and establishment. Two separate components are considered. First, the amount of commodity likely to be imported is estimated. More imports lead to greater risk; therefore, the risk rating for the quantity of commodity is the same for all quarantine pests considered. Second, five biological features, (risk elements) concerning the pest and its interactions with the commodity are considered. The resulting risk ratings are specific to each pest. The cumulative risk rating for introduction was considered to be an indicator of the likelihood that a particular pest would be introduced (USDA, 1995). Table 6 shows our ratings for these risk elements.

Table 6: Risk Rating: Likelihood of Introduction									
Pest	Quantity of commodity imported annually	Likelihood survive postharvest treatment	Likelihood survive shipment	Likelihood not detected at port of entry	Likelihood moved to suitable habitat	Likelihood find suitable host	Risk rating		
Ceratitis capitata	medium	high	high	high	high	high	high		

9. Conclusion: Pest Risk Potential and Phytosanitary Measures

The measure of pest risk potential combines the risk ratings for consequences and likelihood of introduction (USDA, 1995). The estimated pest risk potential for each quarantine pest selected for further analysis for the importation of *Carica papaya* is provided in Table 7.

Table 7: Pest Risk Potential, Quarantine Pests				
Pest risk potential				
Ceratitis capitata	high			

Plant pests with a high Pest Risk Potential may require specific phytosanitary measures. The choice of appropriate sanitary and phytosanitary measures to mitigate risk is undertaken as part of Risk Management and is not addressed, *per se*, in this document.

PPQ has many plant pest interceptions from papaya from other areas; however, virtually all external pests listed could be detected by inspection. Some of these same pests occur in Nicaragua in addition

to other quarantine pests and have been intercepted as hitchhikers with other commodities. Should any of these pests be intercepted on commercial (or any other) shipments of *Carica papaya*, quarantine action may be taken.

C. References

.

- Baker, A. C., Stone, W. E., Plummer, C. C., and McPhail, M. 1944. A review of studies of the Mexican furitfly and related Mexican species. United States Dept. Agric. Mixc. Pub. 531. 155 pp.
- Ben-Dov, Y. 1978. *Andaspis formicarium* n. sp. (Homoptera: Diaspididae) associated with a species of *Milissotarsus* (Hymenoptera, Formicidae) in South Africa. Insects Soc. 25:315-321.
- Ben-Dov, Y. 1981. A Cataloge of the Conchaspididae (Insecta, Homoptera, Coccoidea) of the World. Annales de la Societe Entomologique de France 17:143-156.
- Ben-Dov, Y. 1994. A systematic catalogue of the mealybugs of the world (Insecta: Homoptera: Coccoidea: Pseudococcidae and Putoidae) with data on geographical distribution, host plants, biology and economic importance. Anover, UK.
- Ben-Dov, Y., Williams, M. L., and Ray, C. H. 1975. Taxonony of the mango shield scale *Protopulvinaria mangiferae* (Green) (Homoptera: Coccidae). Israel J. of Entomol. 10:1-17.
- Blackman, R. L. and Eastop, V. F. 1984. Aphids on the World's Crops. An Identification Guide. John Wiley & Sons, N.Y. 466 pp.
- Borge, M. N. R. and Basedow, T. 1997. A survey on the occurrence and flight periods of fruit fly species (Diptera: Tephritidae) in a fruit growing area in southwest Nicaragua, 1994/1995. Bull. Entomol. Res. 87:405-412.
- Brunt, A. A., Crabtree, K., Dallwitz, M. J., Gibbs, A. J. and Watson, L. 1996. Viruses of Plants Descriptions and Lists from the VIDE Database. CAB International, Wallingford, UK. 1484 pp.
- CIE. 1966. Distribution Maps of Pests, Series A No. 219, Ferrisia virgata. Wallingford, UK. CAB International.
- CIE. 1986. Distribution Maps of Pests Series A, No. 191, *Polyphagotarsonemus latus*. Wallingford, Uk, CAB International.
- CMI. 1964a. Description of Pathogenic Fungi and Bacteria, No. 29, *Fusarium solani*. Commonwealth Mycological Institute, England.
- CMI. 1964b. Description of Pathogenic Fungi and Bacteria, No. 35, *Phytophthora nicotianae* var. *parsitica*. Commonwealth Mycological Institute, England.
- CMI. 1964c. Description of Pathogenic Fungi and Bacteria, No. 36, *Pythium aphanidermatum*. Commonwealth Mycological Institute, England.
- CMI. 1967a. Description of Pathogenic Fungi and Bacteria, No. 152, *Erysiphe cichoracearum*. Commonwealth Mycological Institute, England.
- CMI. 1967b. Description of Pathogenic Fungi and Bacteria, No. 159, *Sphaerotheca fuliginea*. Commonwealth Mycological Institute, England.
- CMI. 1972. Description of Pathogenic Fungi and Bacteria, No. 347, *Asperisporium caricae*. Commonwealth Mycological Institute, England.
- CMI. 1974a. Description of Pathogenic Fungi and Bacteria, No. 431, *Botrytis cinerea*. Commonwealth Mycological Institute, England.
- CMI. 1974b. Description of Pathogenic Fungi and Bacteria, No. 406, *Rhizoctonia solani*. Commonwealth Mycological Institute, England.
- CMI. 1975. Description of Pathogenic Fungi and Bacteria, No. 471, *Stemphylium lycopersici*. Commonwealth Mycological Institute, England.
- CMI. 1977 Description of Pathogenic Fungi and Bacteria, No. 524, *Rhizopus stolonifer*. Commonwealth Mycological Institute, England.

- CMI. 1985. Description of Pathogenic Fungi and Bacteria, No. 836, *Phytophthora capsici*. Commonwealth Mycological Institute, England.
- CMI. 1992. Distribution Maps of Plant Diseases, No. 311, *Sclerotium rolfsi*. Commonwealth Mycological Institute, England.
- Davis, M. J., Kramer, J. B., Ferwerda, F. H. and Brunner, B. R. 1996. Association of a bacterium and not a phytoplasma with papaya bunch top disease. American Phytopathological Society. p. 102-
- EPPO. 1995. European and Mediteranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO) Plant Quarantine Retrieval (PQR) System, version 3.0 (Computerized plant pest data base based on: Smith, I. M. 1992. Quarantine Pests for Europe. Oxon, UK: CAB International, Paris: Published in association with the European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization).
- FAO. 1993. Global plant quarantine information system, Plant Pest Data Base, version 2.1. (Computerized Plant Pest Data Base of the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the United Nations). IPPC Secretariat FAO/AGPP Viale delle Terme di Caracalla. Rome.
- FAO. 1996. International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures. Part 1 Import Regulations: Guidelines for Pest Risk Analysis (Draft Standard). Secretariate of the International Plant Protection Convention of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. Rome, Italy. 21 pp.
- Farr, D. F., Bills, G.F., Chamuris, G. P. and Rossman, A. Y. 1989. Fungi on Plants and Plant Products in the United States. American Phytopathological Society, St. Paul, MN. 1252 pp.
- Gunn, C. R. and Ritchie, C. 1982. 1982 Report of the Technical Committee to Evaluate Noxious Weeds; Exotic Weeds for Federal Noxious Weed Act. (unpublished).
- Hodges, R., Dominick, T., Davis, D. R., Ferguson, D. C., Franclemont, J. G., Munroe, E. G. and Powell, J. A. (Eds.) 1983. Check List of the Lepidoptera of America North of Mexico including Greenland. E. W. Classey Limited and the Wedge Entomological Research Foundation. 284 pp.
- Holliday, P. 1980. Fungus diseases of Tropical Crops. Cambridge University Press. 606 pp.
- Holm, L. G., Plucknett, D. L., Pancho, J. V. and Herberger, J. P. 1977. The World's Worst Weeds. University of Hawaii Press, Honolulu. 609 pp.
- Holm, L. G., Pancho, J. V., Herberger, J. P., and Plucknett, D. L. 1979. A Geographical Atlas of World Weeds. John Wiley and Sons, New York. 392 pp.
- Holm, L., Doll, J., Holm, E., Pancho, J., and Herberger, J. 1996. World Weeds, Natural Histories and Distribution. John Wiley and Sons, Inc. 1129 pp.
- Hopper, B. E.(Ed.) 1996. NAPPO Compendium of Phytosanitary Terms. NAPPO Doc. No. 96-027. North American Plant Protection Organization (NAPPO). NAPPO Secretariate, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada. 25 pp.
- Jeppson, L. R., Keifer, H. F. and Baker, E. W. 1975. Mites Injurious to Economic Plants. Univ. of California Press, Berkeley. 614 pp.
- Krochmal, A. 1974. Some common diseases of papaya. Ceiba 18:19-31.
- Lara, F., Marin, F. and Gonzales, M. 1989. Studies of several fruit flies and the incidence of papaya (*Carica papaya* L.) infestation in Costa Rica. Unpublished document.
- Lara, F. 1990. Studies on several fruit flies (Diptera: Tephritidae) and their relationship with papaya in Costa Rica: Summary. Unpublished document.
- Maes, J. M. 1988. Catalogue of the Membracidae (Homoptera) of Nicaragua. Revista Nicaraguense de Entomologia No. 2:19-26.
- Maes, J. M. and Equihua, M. A. 1988. Catalogue of Scolytidae and Platypodidae (Coleoptera) of Nicaragua. Revista Nicaraguense de Entomologia No. 3:1-43.
- Malavasi, A., Martins, D. dos S., Benassi, V. L. R. M., and Loreto, L. 1995. Determination of "solo" papaya status as fruit flies (Tephritidae) host in Espirito Santo State, Brazil with quarantine objectives. Unpublished document. 165 pp.

- Mamet, J. R. 1954. A monograph of the Conchaspididae Green (Homoptera: Coccoidea). Trans. of the Royal Entomol. Soc. of London 105:189-239.
- McGuire, J. U. Jr. and Crandall, B. S. 1967. Survey of Insect Pests and Plant Diseases of Selected Food Crops of Mexico, Central America and Panama. USDA, AID, and ARS. 157 pp.
- Mound, L. A. and Halsey, S. H. 1978. Whitefly of the World. British Museum and John While and Sons, NY. 340 pp.
- Nakahara, S. and Gill, R. J. 1985. Revision of *Philephedra*, including a review of *Lichtensia* in North America and description of a new genus *Metapulvinaria* (Homoptera: Coccidae). Entomography 3:1-42.
- Ploetz, R. C., Zentmyer, G. A., Nishijima, W. T., Rohrbach, K. G., and Ohr, H. D. (Eds.) 1994. Compendium of Tropical Fruit Diseases. American Phytopathological Society. 88 pp.
- Poole, R. W. and Gentile, P. 1996. Nomina Insecta Neartica, A checklist of the insects of North America. Vol. 1, Coleoptera, Strepsiptera. EIS. 827 pp.
- Reed, C. F. 1977. Economically Important Foreign Weeds. Agriculture Handbook No. 498. 746 pp.
- Steck, G. J. 1991. Biochemical systematics and population genetic structure of *Anastrepha fraterulus* and related species (Diptera: Tephritidae). Annals Entomol. Soc. America 84:10-28.
- Steck, G. J. and Sheppard, W. S. 1993. Mitochondrial DNA variation in *Anastrepha fraterculus*. Fruit flies biology and management. Aluja, M. and Liedo P. Editors. Springer-Verlag, NY. p. 9-14.
- Stone, A. 1942. The fruitflies of the genus Anastrepha. USDA Misc. Pub. 439. 122 pp.
- USDA. 1995. Pathway-Initiated Pest Risk Assessment: Guidelines for Qualitative Assessments, Ver 4.0. PPQ, APHIS. 15 pp.
- USDA. 1998. SS 309 Pest Interception Database, APHIS, PPQ. Search completed April 1998.
- Wellman, F. L. 1977. Dictionary of tropical American crops and their diseases. The Scarecrow Press, Inc, Metuchen, N. J. 495 pp.
- White, I. M. and Elson-Harris, M. M. 1992. Fruit Flies of Economic Significance: Their Identification and Bionomics. CAB International, Wallingford, Oxon, UK. 601 pp.
- WSSA, 1989. Composite List of Weeds. Weed Science Society of America.

John Lightfield Biological Assessment and Taxonomic Support Plant Protection and Quarantine August 1997

Reviewed by:

- G. Cave, Entomologist
- R. Stewart, Entomologist
- E. Podleckis, Plant Virologist
- L. Redmond, Plant Pathologist